

3208. Also, petition of the Robbins-Ripley Co., New York City, urging the passage of H. R. 13390; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3209. Also, petition of the Three hundred and fifth Infantry Post, of New York, favoring further relief for disabled soldiers, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3210. Also, petition of the women's auxiliary of the Republican organization of the nineteenth assembly district of New York, favoring the Smith-Towner educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

3211. Also, petition of the National Automobile Dealers' Association, favoring maintenance of daily report on condition of highways in the United States by the Weather Bureau; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3212. Also, petition of H. Brodsky, of the Cloak and Skirt Makers' Union of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring release of political prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3213. Also, petition of the board of directors of the Rotary Club of New York, favoring passage of the Fess-Capper bill to promote physical training in the United States; to the Committee on Education.

3214. Also, petition of the Veterans' Committee on Soldiers' Home, St. Cloud, Fla., urging the passage of the Sears bill, H. R. 3468; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3215. Also, petition of citizens of the State of Washington, urging the passage of House bill 1112; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3216. By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of the Navy Legal Aid Association, urging the immediate enactment of the Wadsworth bill increasing pay of enlisted men; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, April 24, 1920.

(Legislative day of Friday, April 23, 1920.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Reading Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Gronna	McLean	Spencer
Brandegge	Harris	McNary	Sterling
Capper	Harrison	Nelson	Swanson
Chamberlain	Henderson	New	Thomas
Comer	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Townsend
Curtis	Kellogg	Page	Trammell
Dial	Kendrick	Phipps	Warren
Dillingham	Kenyon	Sheppard	
Fernald	McCormick	Simmons	
Gerry	McCumber	Smith, Md.	

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] is absent on account of illness in his family.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], due to illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Thirty-seven Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The roll of absentees will be called.

The Reading Clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. GLASS, Mr. LENROOT, Mr. RANDELL, and Mr. WADSWORTH answered to their names when called.

Mr. NUGENT, Mr. JONES of New Mexico, Mr. KEYES, Mr. LODGE, Mr. SMITH of Arizona, Mr. PITTMAN, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. KIRBY, and Mr. MCKELLAR entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT], the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION.

Mr. STERLING. On Tuesday last, the bill (H. R. 10917) to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the National Education Association of the United States," was received from the House, and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] asked that it be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. To that there was some objection by the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], who suggested that it should go to the Com-

mittee on the Judiciary. At the instance of the Senator from Utah the bill was ordered to lie upon the table. I understand that the Senator from Iowa is agreed that the bill may be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and I ask that that reference be made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection the bill will be so referred.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, one of its clerks, announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9629) for the relief of the Merritt & Chapman Derrick & Wrecking Co.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2448) for the relief of certain officers of the United States Army, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2890) to provide for the allotment of land of Crow Tribe, for the distribution of tribal funds, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2396. An act for the relief of John A. Gauley;

H. R. 10317. An act for the relief of Blanche Utley; and

H. J. Res. 302. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation for the participation of the United States in the observance of the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims at Provincetown and Plymouth, Mass.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LODGE. I present a series of resolutions adopted by the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts favoring legislation for daylight saving, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The resolutions were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
In the year one thousand nine hundred and twenty.

Resolutions urging the passage of a Federal daylight-saving law.

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States a daylight-saving bill, so called, which puts the clock forward during the summer season for the Eastern States, now under United States standard eastern time: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts, believing it to be established by the experience of the past two years that the daylight-saving law has contributed to the health and efficiency of the people of the United States and to economy in the various means of heating and lighting, hereby urges the enactment of the aforesaid bill into law; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the presiding officers of both branches of Congress and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this Commonwealth.

In senate, adopted April 5, 1920.

In house of representatives, adopted, in concurrence, April 8, 1920.

A true copy.

Attest:

ALBERT T. LANGLEY,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Mr. SUTHERLAND presented a memorial of the congregation of the Church of the Brethren, of Beaver Run, W. Va., and a memorial of the Church of the Brethren, of Old Furnace, W. Va., remonstrating against compulsory military training, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SPENCER submitted an amendment providing that the United States park police be allowed increased compensation for the fiscal year 1921, in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 4285) requiring the branding of the manufacturers' selling price on shoes transported in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Manufactures.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 4286) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the incorporated town of Petersburg, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$75,000 for the purpose of constructing and installing a municipal electric light and power plant, and for the construction of a public-school building," approved September 29, 1919; to the Committee on Territories.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Swem, one of his clerks, announced that the President had on this day approved and signed the act (S. 4073) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River near Kansas City.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2396. An act for the relief of John A. Gauley; and

H. R. 10317. An act for the relief of Blanche Utley.

H. J. Res. 302. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation for the participation of the United States in the observance of the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims at Provincetown and Plymouth, Mass., was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask that the unfinished business may be laid before the Senate and proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11892) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment is the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] to the committee amendment. It will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 1, line 3, strike out "\$20,000,000" and insert "\$27,000,000," so as to read:

That the sum of \$27,000,000 be, and the same hereby is, appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated—

And so forth.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to engage in a detailed discussion of the proposed legislation. I, however, wish the indulgence of the Senate for a short time to present my views chiefly with reference to the policy upon which the pending bill was framed. The bill as it came from the House would make the most niggardly provision for river and harbor maintenance and improvement ever heretofore, so far as I recall, proposed by any committee of either branch of the Congress. As a matter of common knowledge, for many years an organized propaganda has been conducted in this country against expenditures by the Government for the improvement of inland waterways. It has been charged, and it is generally believed, that this propaganda was largely inspired and fostered by the railroads for selfish purposes. However that may be, the object of the propaganda was to arouse popular prejudice against river and, in some instances, harbor improvements. It has been one of the most active propagandas ever conducted in this country. By the dissemination of misleading and sometimes false information with respect to the manner in which river and harbor bills are prepared in committee and passed through Congress, by unfounded attacks upon the engineers of the Government who investigated and reported upon the feasibility in the interest of commerce, of the items of improvement embraced in these bills, and by minimizing in every way the benefits which have resulted from Government expenditures in these improvements, a public sentiment not only unfriendly but actually hostile to legislation of this character has been created.

River and harbor legislation has been labeled as "pork-barrel" legislation, and the money spent for this purpose as a reckless and wasteful use of public funds. Undoubtedly much prejudice against expenditures for these purposes has been aroused, and it is now charged that an effort is being made in the Congress to utilize this prejudice for partisan purposes. In these circumstances it is not difficult to understand the reasoning of those who think that the partisan economy pretense about which we now hear so much will be advanced more by cutting off a few millions from the estimate presented by the department than by lopping off a few hundred millions from departmental estimates for more popular purposes. Upon this theory it is said that the House committee at the dictation of a political steering committee to make a show of economy for campaign purposes cut the estimates of the Engineer Department for rivers and harbors in half. If any such considerations influenced the reduction in the estimates of the department to the insignificant sum carried in the House bill, I do not think it can be too severely condemned. Mr. President, I want to say on behalf of the Committee on Commerce, of which I am a member, that if there has been any attempt at dictation by a partisan committee, I know nothing of it and have seen no evidences of it. That committee has very substantially increased the appropriation proposed in the House bill. It has not raised it to the amount of the depart-

ment estimate, but it has added \$8,000,000 to the amount carried in the House bill.

While I am not satisfied with the amount which the bill as reported to the Commerce Committee carries and think it still wholly inadequate, my purpose in the further observations I shall make will be not so much to criticize the amount of the appropriations provided as to dissent from the policy that obtained in the making of the bill, not only in the committee of the House but of the Senate. The dominating feature of that policy is that no new schemes of river and harbor improvement should be adopted or undertaken. This policy of restriction in the improvement of our harbors utterly ignores the fact that our commerce has increased several fold in the past few years, and is still increasing, and it overlooks the fact that in this period our ships of commerce have increased and are still increasing in a much greater degree. Moreover, it ignores the fact that while these increases have been taking place our railroad mileage has not increased and is not likely to materially increase for a long time to come; that only a few congested harbors of the North Atlantic seaboard have been adequately developed, while the great harbors on the Pacific coast, the Gulf, and the South Atlantic are, in the main, unimproved and inadequately prepared to accommodate the traffic which the new policy of the Government, as forecast in the action of the Railroad Administration and the Shipping Board, and as further developed and declared in the shipping bill now pending in the Commerce Committee, is calculated to promote and develop. The policy implied in the attitude of the committee does not stop with a refusal to even so much as consider the adoption of any new program of improvement and development of our harbors.

It goes much further and proposes that where Congress has actually entered upon the improvement of a river or harbor, if the present needs of commerce do not require the immediate completion of that project it shall be abandoned temporarily and no expenditure made except to protect against deterioration. Because of the adoption of this policy many of the great projects upon which we have entered in the interest of commerce, which are only partially completed and, in many instances, which lack only a small additional expenditure to become available for the uses of commerce, are, for the present if not permanently, to be abandoned. Against such a line of policy I most earnestly protest and insist that now is the time of all times in our history calling for a forward-looking and not a backward-looking policy with respect to the development of our system of transportation by water as well as by rail, with a view to the development of our commerce, internal and external, to the full extent of its potentialities. I assert and strenuously insist that present conditions with respect to facilities for the movement and accommodation of our stupendous trade appeal for liberality rather than cheeseparing economy of expenditures in developing agencies for its transportation, and for the Congress to deliberately resolve in these conditions to enter upon no new projects of harbor and waterway improvements in order to save a few thousand dollars when millions and billions are involved is, to my mind, so shortsighted and so reckless in its disregard of the national interest as to be utterly incredible. If it is done to subserve party interest, it is criminal. If it is done through mistaken judgment, it is discreditable and is in itself an indictment against the capacity of the party in power to wisely legislate in the public interest. In short, we can not approve and adopt this policy without shutting our eyes to the outstanding facts of the present situation with respect to our world trade and the conditions, extent, and requirements of our land and ocean transportation facilities.

Mr. President, what is the condition with reference to our harbor and transportation facilities? On yesterday the able Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] told the Senate that about 80 per cent of the entire foreign trade of the United States during the last year passed through the harbor of New York. The statement of the Senator from New York in this respect is, I think, approximately true, and it is a pity that it is true. Think of a great country like ours, 3,000 miles wide, over 2,000 miles long, every section of it engaged in the production and the consumption of articles that enter into foreign commerce, and yet 80 per cent of that commerce, amounting in the single month of March just passed to over a billion and a quarter of dollars, must be hauled hundreds and thousands of miles overland going from or coming to one congested outlet and inlet located on the North Atlantic coast. Will any Senator say that this situation is either healthy or economical? Will any Senator deny that it involves an indefensible, not to say intolerable, waste in time, in human energy, and in money? Does any Senator advocate the continuance of such a condition? And does not the situation thus presented—a situation which only recently

resulted in such widespread industrial congestion and demoralization—suggest the imperative necessity for the immediate utilization of the neglected and idle harbors of our Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts? This condition of port congestion arrests expansion, and while retarding adds enormously to the cost of distribution. The people may endure for a while conditions which restrict industrial development and impose burdens upon the distribution of their products, but they will not submit to it long.

Think of the condition of the South, a great industrial section, a great agricultural section, with its splendid natural ports from Jacksonville to Norfolk, producing many of the things that we sell to South and Central America, and buying and consuming many of the things that we buy from these countries, countries that may be described as next-door neighbors of this section. Think of transportation conditions which require this section to haul its products destined to South and Central American markets in many cases a thousand miles by rail up the Atlantic coast to New York, and thence shipping them on their way to their final destination a thousand miles down that coast right by the ocean gateways to the harbors of Wilmington, Charleston, Savannah, and Jacksonville. Think of the burden of cost involved in this process of distribution. What is true of the States of the South Atlantic seaboard is true of some of the States on the Pacific seaboard and the Gulf coast, and, to a lesser extent, true of that great region known as the Central West, which lies hundreds of miles nearer to these ports than to those of the North Atlantic, to which they have to go now. Think of what it would mean in relieving this waste in transportation and of what it would mean in relieving railroad congestion in certain sections if, instead of all this traffic having to be hauled by a few lines of railway to the seaboard, it could be divided among many lines, relieving congestion of the overburdened roads and increasing the revenue of the underfed roads leading to these neglected and idle ports. If this could be done, it would measurably solve the question of the adequacy of transportation in this country. Mr. President, I am glad to say that a promising beginning looking to this result has been made.

Two difficulties have been in the way of the utilization of these idle ports in the past. One of them was the lack of ships; the other was discrimination in export and import rates, both land and ocean rates, against these ports and in favor of ports of the North Atlantic. As a result of an energetic movement, not only on the part of shippers in the South Atlantic, but on the part of shippers in the Central West, this discrimination in rates, both ocean and inland, has been removed, and the Shipping Board has allocated ships for the establishment of lines between these ports and the islands of the West Indies and South and Central American Republics, and some of them are in operation, with a business already developed to promising proportions. The Committee of Commerce have now under consideration a broad and comprehensive scheme providing for the continued utilization of these harbors and the continuance of these newly established routes, even if it shall become necessary for the Government itself to operate them. But, Mr. President, these harbors, as I said, have been neglected; they have not in the past been improved to any very great extent because it was said that their developed commerce would not justify it. And now we are told that this is not the time for the Government to enter upon new projects of river and harbor improvement. How long will this policy be adhered to, and must we wait indefinitely before the Government will be permitted to improve and develop these harbors to meet these new conditions of trade, the development of which is so important in connection with our efforts to capture the great trade awaiting us in the countries just to the south of us?

Will anybody say, in the light of present conditions, that money spent to put these neglected harbors in a condition to subserve this great trade would be unwisely spent and that it is wise economy to postpone appropriations for this purpose? And yet, Mr. President, under the policy of this bill these improvements, however urgently needed as the result of present conditions and the development of new routes which have been ordered to be established by the Shipping Board and to which ships have been allocated, can have no appropriation made for their advancement unless it can be shown that the engineers have heretofore recommended the improvement and that Congress has, by making an initial appropriation, adopted the project. This blind and restrictive policy was adopted when the last river and harbor bill was framed and approved by the Congress. It was ill adapted to the conditions which then existed; it is less adapted to the conditions which now exist. But, Mr. President, I am talking too long and I am venturing into fields

I had not intended to traverse. My purpose in the observations I have made has been to impress upon the Senate the importance and wisdom, in the conditions which now confront us, of liberal instead of niggardly appropriations, or no appropriations at all, to put our harbors in condition to accommodate the great foreign trade we have already developed and the still greater trade of the future, and of continuing to improve our rivers and harbors as the best means of supplementing our insufficient rail transportation. In the present condition of our rail transportation I can conceive of no more short-sighted policy than the neglect of our waterways, which at this time seem to furnish the only feasible means of adequately supplementing rail transportation and thereby protecting the industries of the country against the menace which now threatens to arrest their further development and expansion.

What, Mr. President, is the situation with respect to our rail transportation? For 8 or 10 years our railroad facilities have been admittedly inadequate, and yet during that period, industrially the most progressive period in our history, there has been practically no increase in the railroad mileage of the country. Railroad building has practically ceased, while the demands for transportation have almost doubled. Where is the money to be found to finance the building of the additional mileage required? If the railroads had all the money needed for this purpose, it would still require five or six years, possibly more, before the demands for additional transportation could be fully supplied. But the railroads have no surplus. They are overburdened with debt; they are behind, not ahead, in their finances. I repeat, they have no money for new construction and but slim, if any, chance of raising it. A policy which in these circumstances militates against the utilization of our waterways to supplement rail transportation is, to my mind, the height of folly and approaches the very verge of stupidity. Instead of curtailing our river and harbor improvement work in these conditions, every dollar that is necessary or that can be economically used for their improvement to supply the future as well as present needs of commerce should be appropriated. A policy with respect to the transportation requirements of a country like ours which fails to anticipate future needs and conditions and provide for those conditions before they overtake and overwhelm us is necessarily a short-sighted policy.

Mr. President, there is no vision in this bill; it is short-sighted and narrow. If it were left to me, I would pursue as liberal a policy toward improvement of our rivers and harbors as I would pursue in reference to our Army and our Navy or any other instrumentality of Government. The Army and Navy are necessary to our national defense and must be maintained, regardless of expense. So must our other necessary governmental activities, but the means for the support and maintenance of these necessary functions of government, greater to-day than ever before in the history of our country, greater than those of any other country in the world, must come from the commercial activities of our people. We hear much talk in these days of the enormous amounts the Government must of necessity expend for this and that public service. We hear much about our vast indebtedness. These obligations can not be avoided or escaped; they have got to be met and discharged, and they can not be met and discharged if we neglect to foster and develop in every way in our power the commerce and industries of the people. Mr. President, these considerations demand that we should not only develop and utilize the transportation potentiality of our rivers and harbors but that we should compel our railroads to cooperate with our waterways to the fullest extent in furnishing needed facilities to aid our great and growing commerce and trade, whether domestic or foreign.

For these reasons, in my judgment, no greater mistake has been made by the Congress during the past few years than in the niggardly, cheeseparing policy it has pursued and which it is proposed in this bill to continue with reference to the improvement and development of our rivers and harbors. It is a policy which fails to provide for the present or to anticipate the future in a way and to an extent that is discreditable to the lawmaking power of the Nation. I am going to vote for this bill, but I hope it may be amended so as to substantially increase the amount of the lump sum to be appropriated. I shall vote for amendments for this purpose. I shall vote for an amendment to increase it \$4,000,000. I shall vote for an amendment to increase it \$7,000,000. I would vote for an amendment, if offered, for a still greater increase. Before taking my seat I want to say, Mr. President, that I earnestly hope this is the last river and harbor bill that will have to run the gauntlet of manufactured prejudice and the exigencies of a political campaign. I protest against the injection of politics into purely

business legislation. If it is desired to make a record for economy there is ample opportunity to cut down expenses without injury but with benefit to the country. It is indefensible to attempt to make a record of economy at the expense of the business interests of the country, its development and its expansion.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, the bill before us this afternoon has a direct bearing upon the high cost of Government, and the high cost of Government has a direct bearing on the high cost of living, which prompts me to submit a few observations on a subject in which I am very much interested.

Mr. President, while the Department of Justice is pursuing the profiteer with steakless Thursdays and the Treasury Department is fortifying the people with preachments on thrift and economy, another epidemic of strikes and industrial disorder has come upon us as the result of rampant, long-continued, unrestricted profiteering and we go on increasing prices.

No country can adjust itself to constantly increasing prices. No country can be enriched by the gouge process. Our delusion of prosperity continues, but our volume of business is declining, as might be expected. Prices for American products have soared so high that both home consumption and what foreign demand there is are failing us. Between high profits and high taxes the people have been hit hard. As a source of wealth for business or for exploitation they are not inexhaustible. And the results we are getting are telling the story.

The extent to which the people have been bled by war and extortion is almost unbelievable. A recent statistical report relates that 79,642 American corporations, many of whose stockholders are now dodging their income taxes through stock dividends, averaged gross profits of more than \$500,000,000 apiece in a single year. It is illuminating also to learn that in just one year during the war the gross income of American corporations rose from thirty-five and one-third billions to eighty-four and a half billions. In a single year the war gave us 10,173 new corporations, and they are few in number, indeed, who have not piled up enormous net profits and great wealth on the capital invested.

The proof of profiteering is the margin of profit. We know that margin has never been wider, nor greed more insatiable.

Do you suppose, Mr. President, that the people who pinch, skimp, and are being forced to do without many things they need, in order that we may continue to double the prewar number of our millionaires every twelvemonth, thrill with patriotic fervor whenever they read an unctious lesson on thrift and 100 per cent Americanism from one of these 1,000 per cent American tax-dodging grandstanders, or that it merely arouses their American dander and promotes wrath and profanity?

The same day a Texas cotton raiser wrote me he had to go to the public works in order to pay the grocery bill for which he went in debt while raising his 1919 crop. I read in a New York newspaper that the net profits of the Amoskeag spinning mills for 1919 were seven times greater than those it cleared in 1917, and that its 1918 profits were thirteen times greater than those it earned in the four years between 1912 and 1916.

All this, over and above deductions for taxes, high cost of labor and materials, and all the other things which we are commonly and repeatedly informed are responsible for the exorbitant prices this and other corporations are allowed to charge the American people for the actual necessities of life.

This cotton farmer wrote me:

The profiteers have cleaned me up, and what is still more they will be on the job next year and the next, and so on until we all become reds, radicals, Bolsheviks, and devils. I am tired making millionaires of 2,000 poptoyed parasites each year while reducing my family to pauperism. I don't want to blow up anybody or any institution, for I prefer to live like and act like a white man, but this profiteering all along the line will have to stop or I shan't be able to do either.

From a man in his circumstances I do not call that an intemperate letter. In fact, it shows great restraint.

The mill that took this man's cotton at a price which, because of the general prevalence of profiteering, impoverished him and his hard-working family, increased its margin of profit from 2½ cents on every dollar of its sales in 1917 to 15½ cents in 1919. And this Government is supposed to be hunting for profiteers.

Mr. President, the speculation and profiteering in cotton and cotton goods has been open, flagrant, scandalous. The Associated Press, just a few days ago, carried the information where all the world might read, that the Belton Cotton Mills, at Belton, S. C., had declared a dividend of 100 per cent, and that the Easley Cotton Mills, of Easley, S. C., had declared a stock dividend of 300 per cent. It is equally well known that the Senate committee investigating the high cost of living was recently presented with visual and auricular proof that the spread

between the farm price of cotton and the store price of cotton materials was about 1,800 per cent, and that the retail price of cotton goods is so high that ordinary persons can scarcely buy bedding, cottons, muslins, and gingham. If this is not grand larceny in the daytime, I do not know what else we should call it.

A New York newspaper, the Evening World, recently published the profit records of big corporations like the Amoskeag Manufacturing Co., the American Hide & Leather Co., the Woolen Trust, the Cotton Trust, the Steel Trust, the United Fruit Co., the Standard Milling Co., the Tobacco Products Corporation, the Manhattan Shirt Co., the United Drug Co., the American Linseed Co., and others, and proved by their own reports that their earnings have far more than kept pace with their cost and taxes, exceeding them in not infrequent instances from 100 to several hundred per cent, and in some cases far exceeding 1,000 per cent. In each instance the attention of the Attorney General was directed to this easily accessible evidence. But nothing has come of it.

At this moment the most brazen challenge of the Government we have had in this long saturnalia of greed comes from the gamblers in sugar. We are told, Mr. President, the refineries are unable to provide for the enormous new stocks of sugar. But a corner in sugar has evidently been formed right under the eyes of the Department of Justice. As a consequence, no such wild scramble for sugar shares ever was known. Cuban-American at 580 rose 40 points in one day. Forty thousand shares of Punta Alegre were sold at a rise of 11 points. Tens of thousands of shares of other members of the sugar group were sold at advanced quotations, while sugar-refining stocks also boomed because of the increase of spread between the raw and the refined product.

Mr. President, this body and this Government are soon to hear very emphatically from the people in regard to the profiteering in sugar. The canning season raid is on. The price already is rising about a dollar a week wholesale in early anticipation of the canning season. For years the sugar interests have annually and shamelessly and openly robbed American housewives during the canning season. They have, with their extortionate charges, as regularly blighted the poor family's only hope of putting up and storing away a cheap and wholesome supply of fruits and vegetables for winter. Every principle of healthful living demands just these things in the family diet. But the Sugar Trust is allowed to prey on the health and welfare of this Nation every year in the canning season that it may enrich itself further by profits running high in the hundreds of millions. The people are helpless; there is no real substitute for sugar. It is piracy so colossal and so criminal that Capt. Kidd and all the famous pirates of history become Sunday-school characters by comparison. How long is this Government going to stand for it?

Sugar speculators blandly predict sugar will sell at 30 cents or more a pound retail when the canning season opens. Conservative wholesalers say the price to the consumer will reach or exceed 50 cents a pound before it closes. One billion pounds of sugar have recently been exported from these shores to Great Britain in addition to the millions of pounds shipped abroad during recent weeks or months, says a current news report. This Government owes it to itself and to the American people to declare at once an embargo on sugar and to seize immediately every stock of this commodity in the United States for distribution to the consumer at cost, because a Government that is sworn to protect its people permits this robbery and puts no curb upon it. This profit-taking campaign and canning-time hike of the speculators and profiteers in sugar now surpasses in barefaced, nation-wide grand larceny any brutal and impudent demand yet made on this long-suffering and outraged Nation. The American colonists went to war with George III for much less when they dumped his taxed tea in Boston Harbor and defied him. Are we now to permit a few score of reckless and greedy exploiters to victimize the American people at will?

These profiteers are known but they go unpunished. Wall Street's melon patches continue to be warmed by the sun of privilege, fertilized by the perspiration of labor, and watered by the tears of poverty, and this year will raise a record-breaking crop free from the blight of income taxes, while the people are being urged to buy their coal early and be robbed for less, to abstain from steak one day a week, and to purchase war savings stamps that Uncle Sam may live on in nine-billion style on a six-billion-a-year income.

Mr. President, if the law-enforcement officers of this Government can not enforce the laws they should resign and let men who can take their places. A Government that could whip the

Hun 4,000 miles from home and wreck the German spy system is strong enough to stop this wholesale pillage of the people at home and so remove the cause of strikes and unrest.

The Wall Street Journal publishes a list of 62 corporations which declared stock dividends aggregating \$321,009,952 during 1916, 1917, and 1918, on which the Government will now have to refund income taxes. Stock dividends of millions of other surplus profits that the Supreme Court has ruled are principal, and therefore not taxable for income, are being made daily by other corporations. As further conclusive evidence of prolonged, unlimited, and unconscionable profiteering by great aggregations of capital I offer this list of corporations that have recently declared stock dividends ranging in amount from one-fifth of their total investment to double and triple their entire capital. Note the high percentages:

Continental Oil, 200 per cent; United Fuel Gas, 200 per cent; Ohio Fuel Supply, 100 per cent; Nonquit Spinning Co., 100 per cent; Amoskeag Cotton Manufacturing Co., 100 per cent; Stutz Motors, 100 per cent; Nashua Manufacturing Co., 100 per cent; American Tobacco Security Co., 75 per cent; Manomet Mills 55½ per cent; Hood Rubber Co., 66½ per cent; Crucible Steel, 50 per cent; Cleveland-Akron Bag, 50 per cent; Union Bag & Paper, 50 per cent; Auto-Car Co., 40 per cent; John R. Thompson Co., 33½ per cent; St. Maurice Paper Co., 30 per cent; F. W. Woolworth, 30 per cent; Electric Welding of Boston, 25 per cent; Delaware & Cleveland, 25 per cent; Hawaiian Pineapple Co., 25 per cent; Electric Welding Co., 25 per cent; General Chemical Co., 20 per cent; American Multigraph, 20 per cent; Truscan Steel, 20 per cent.

The Standard Oil Co. of Indiana has recently increased its capital from \$1,000,000 to \$30,000,000, giving its stockholders a stock dividend of 2,900 per cent.

Also it is instructive to learn that the National Candy Co.'s earnings last year showed an increase of 545 per cent over 1915; that Burns Bros., the largest retail coal dealers in the United States, made a net profit of 40 cents a ton, against 23½ cents in 1916; that the earnings of the United Drug Co., doing a business of \$50,000,000 annually, were 242 per cent greater than 1916; that the American Ice Co., which cuts ice by the millions, but not profits, has in the last four years increased its earnings 283 per cent; that the International Cotton Co., doing nearly \$8,000,000 worth of business last year, made 39 per cent more money, although it sold 20 per cent fewer goods; that the Pacific Mills' output of cotton and worsted dress goods produced 34 per cent more profit than in the year before the war; and that the excess-profit surplus of United States Steel—the surplus remaining after dividends—has aggregated nearly \$500,000,000 in the last five years, although \$315,000,000 was spent on improvements.

These patriotic melon raisers, who have made their millions and billions during and since the war, now are urging that the soldiers' bonus be raised by a 1 per cent tax on sales to be paid on every dollar spent by every man, woman, and child in the country, including the ex-service men themselves. Mr. President, I shall favor placing this tax right where it belongs—on war profits—and taking from these huge stock dividends, from excess war profits, and from the profiteers, all that is needful to compensate the men who sacrificed themselves instead of their country, or their countrymen, in time of war.

During the coal strike, while zero cold and privation threatened the people, the price of crude oil shot up nearly 300 per cent, and still is rising. The oil men have the same golden rule as the lumbermen and the sugar barons, namely, their price limit is all they can compel the consumer to pay, and they are scientific compellers. There is none more compelling. They have boosted oil from 40 cents, in 1915, to \$3 a barrel and higher, a gain of more than 650 per cent; and while prices are being screwed up a notch or two more "to encourage production" their wives are importing \$250,000 works of art from Europe and stopping at no extravagance at home.

The papers told yesterday of a Texas oil company that is expected soon to cut a 400 per cent stock-dividend melon. Each stockholder will be permitted to buy one new share at \$100 for every share of old stock he holds. The old shares are now quoted at \$850, having risen to that figure from a par value of \$100.

It is said the poor man's luxury is tobacco. Its use is so general that it is even considered a necessity by many persons. It is interesting to note in this connection that the contribution to good government of the Tobacco Products Corporation is a dividend balance showing a rise of 1,547 per cent over its 1914 profits, which the smoker had to pay or go without this solace.

Smokers generally will be interested in learning that the General Cigar Co., which in 1906 acquired the property and

business of the old United Cigar Co., amassed a net income of nearly 34 cents on each dollar of its sales in 1917, and in 1919 this had grown to almost 38 cents, notwithstanding nearly all 7-cent cigars in the market have recently been advanced to 8 cents retail.

Other upholders of government and befrienders of the poor are the American Hide & Leather Co., whose profits for 1919 were more than three and one-half times larger than those it gained in 1914; the Central Leather Co., whose 1919 profits were more than double those of the same months in 1918; and the Endicott-Johnson Shoe Manufacturing Corporation, whose profits rose from \$2,174,430 in 1915 to \$9,791,580 in 1919.

In terms of dividends on its common stock, last year's profits of the American Hide & Leather Co. increased from 44 cents a share in 1915 to \$15.52 a share in 1919, or thirty-five times the earnings it distributed in 1915, and they were ample.

During the first nine months of the same year, while the Government was hunting high and low for rampant profiteers, and the price of shoes was steadily going higher and the price of hides was as steadily going lower, the net earnings of the Central Leather Co. increased 55 per cent, or about 103 per cent over the average nine months of 1918. Its accumulated surplus rose from seven and three-fourths millions in 1914 to thirty and one-fourth millions in 1919. Yet despite these swollen profits the public is being warned that shoes are going to cost more instead of less.

Mr. President, for four years wheat farmers, as a whole, have little more than broken even. The size of the American loaf has been reduced for the first time in history, and the price has been nearly doubled. But the net profits of the 15 plants of the Standard Milling Co. have been increased 100 per cent, but not because of increased wages and taxes.

The National Enameling & Stamping Co. makes kitchen ware. Prior to the war it successfully met the severe competition of Germany and earned a fair return on its investment. In three recent years it has run up its net profits 326 per cent, because it could hold up American housewives and there was no one to say it nay. A Wall Street report says this company earned in the month of January alone enough to pay all its fixed charges and preferred dividends for the year. Here is a fine example of unmitigated, overreaching greed.

I have recently received a letter from Lakin C. Taylor, of the Pittsburgh Tin Plate & Steel Corporation. The Pittsburgh Tin Plate & Steel Corporation, with plants or offices in Pittsburgh, New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Baltimore, Rochester, Cleveland, Buffalo, Cincinnati, Columbus, Albany, Newark, Toledo, and Syracuse, offers to sell me or my friends some of the Pittsburgh company's stock. It writes me under date of March 27 last that additions planned for its mills should increase present earnings over 300 per cent. And, as if this were not sufficiently inviting, it points out that "every operating tin-plate and sheet-steel mill has made enormous fortunes for its stockholders, many of their common shares selling at 1,500 per cent premium."

A similar steel company—

So the letter relates—

organized by the head of this corporation earned 77 per cent last year, and the holders of the common stock made a profit of over 1,000 per cent.

Here is one profiteer who cheerfully admits it in writing on his own letterhead sent through the United States mails, which guarantees the facts in that letter are as stated, as the mails of the United States can not be used to defraud. I respectfully refer these facts to the Attorney General.

Profits of the American Sugar Refining Co. were confessedly \$15,000,000 for 1919, compared with \$12,000,000 for the preceding year, although this corporation's share of the business in the United States has dwindled from 60 per cent in 1900, when it had virtually a monopoly, down to 27 per cent.

During the last few years the sugar companies have declared stock dividends from surplus profits aggregating millions—on which Uncle Sam must now refund income taxes—besides regular and excessive cash dividends. Even the earnings of the American Beet Sugar Co. are expected to show profits of \$15 a share for 1919, compared with \$6 the preceding year. And sugar is taking another leap skyward, probably to increase the billion of dollars to be exacted in higher profits this year from the American people. Meanwhile sugar imports from Cuba exceed the capacity of the refineries.

Mr. President, the humble banana, controlled by the United Fruit Co., with its fleet of 23 ships, has become a kingly profiteer. The net earnings for 15 months, ending December last, equal 40 per cent on fifty millions of stock outstanding, rounding up a surplus for the last 51 months equal to nearly 122 per cent. If ten millions set aside as a war-risk reserve fund are added, the

total surplus that the United Fruit Co. has piled up within the last four years would amount to 141 per cent. I leave it to you to judge whether it is an unwarranted or a harsh use of words to call this corporation an unmitigated price pirate and profit gouger.

To be complete, a list of examples in profit extortion would include a great many other corporations in the United States. The few that have been cited and the situation of the people are sufficient to indicate the magnitude of this menace to our efforts to reach sounder and saner times.

We have more than 700,000 tons of meat in the United States, enormous oversupplies of butter, cheese, rice, and other grains and foods, and should be bending every effort to increase consumption, that this plenty be not followed by as great a shortage through slackened production. Speculators have reaped great profits through market inflation, prices are held so high that the people are reducing their standard of living, as reported by the Department of Agriculture, and tons of food held by profiteers until unfit to eat are condemned and destroyed by Government agents.

This is most sordid and wicked folly. For if consumption is not increased instead of lessened, if our wall of prices which compels the bulk of what foreign demand there is to seek South American markets is not lowered, then we may have no-steak weeks in reality instead of by proclamation at no distant day. Our greatest industry—agriculture—tied hand and foot has been made the helpless victim of speculators and profiteers until it must have untrammelled markets and economic freedom if the people of the United States are ever again to be fed on a live-and-let-live basis.

Mr. President, it is wrong to assume, because extravagance flaunts itself in our cities, that plenty exists in all the homes of the land. People who have never known want or privation are living to-day in tents instead of homes; small houses in the big industrial centers shelter two families instead of one; thousands of men, women, and children are compelled to do without necessary shoes and clothing, if not fuel, and certain articles of food—all because the exorbitant prices at which these things are held by those who control them are beyond their means.

The war period has developed several hundred brand-new millionaires in the lumber industry. Back of the car shortage and all other alibis behind which the outrageous profiteering in lumber seeks to mask its insatiable greed is the very strong suspicion that the mills and the supply are controlled and the regulated output doled out to the highest bidder at auction prices. Since July 1, 1919, lumber has advanced from 100 to 200 per cent.

City rent hogs are not satisfied with a 20 per cent return on capital invested, but hold up frantic bidders seeking shelter for all and more than they are able to pay.

Green hides sell at 15 cents a pound in the Southwest but sole leather at \$2. First-class packer hides, salted and trimmed, which brought 56 cents a pound in October, now are a drug on the market. But a leading shoe manufacturer, quoted by the Associated Press, says shoes are to be no cheaper for a long, long time. It is still to take the best part, if not all, of the average man's weekly wage to buy a good pair.

When we know these facts, is it strange that we read of mayors, governors, and commissions pursuing rapacious land-lords, largely because this Government of the people seems able to do little more for the people than to urge them to eat less and wear less and save their money and buy thrift stamps?

Mr. President, in the name of the peace, progress, prosperity, and welfare of the United States and every one of its people, we must not only demand but must bring about and enforce a nation-wide square deal. It is no one man's job, or nation's. The problem is not ours alone; it is world-wide. And this problem is the working out of a system by which big business may be controlled in such a way as will not impair its efficiency, initiative, and usefulness in serving the people, but which will effectively prevent any exploiting of those its true mission is to serve.

It is time 100 per cent Americanism were defined, so that a perplexed public will fully understand what is meant by the term. If it is 100 per cent Americanism to evade taxes, cheat the Government, and swindle the people, let this be fairly understood. But it would be instructive to be informed just what difference there is in principle between cheating the Government, or putting it in bad, and attempting to undermine and overthrow it in the rude manner of the Bolshevik. Both methods equal the same result, only one is merely more crafty than the other in attaining it.

Mr. President, it is not so much the individual but our present system which is to blame for the conscienceless squeezing of the people for huge profits. To say that this evil can not be con-

trolled is to say that this Government could not make national banks safe when we all know that it has. The Old World found it necessary and has regulated, or relegated, most of its kings. We shall do so with the pirates of the business world. We can regulate profits as we have regulated usury, and in such regulation provision can be made for maintaining a sinking fund for the lean years. The working out of such a system should be the task of the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission, and in performing that task they may well take into consideration all effective steps taken in foreign countries toward beneficially controlling business in the interest of all.

The need of drastic action by governmental agencies in the enforcement of the laws we now have has been increasingly evident for months. We already have laws against profiteering. If those charged with enforcement of these laws will see that the profit hogs are sent to jail, prices will soon tumble. The United States has become a robbers' roost. Greed has become morally and criminally lawless. In self-protection we must find the remedy and apply it.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I have listened with very great interest to the remarks just made by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and I simply want to emphasize one thing that he has said.

We are all constantly receiving protests over nonaction of Congress relative to the cost of living. The fact is that Congress has passed laws that if properly enforced would stop this profiteering; and if one millionaire profiteer were sent to the penitentiary at Leavenworth for a term under the laws that now exist, it would do more to stop this profiteering than all the schemes and all the protests that have been made regarding it.

Why is not this administration enforcing the law that now exists? The fact is that our present Attorney General is setting a few mouse traps around the country where he ought to be setting some bear traps.

Just the other day we read of a little merchant in lower New York who was arrested for profiteering because he had sold an overcoat at 50 per cent profit, and the next morning we read in the New York papers that that little merchant had committed suicide; but we are not reading anything in the newspapers of any action by this administration looking toward the conviction of the big profiteers. Why, take the case of sugar, to which the Senator from Kansas referred. The President refused to exercise the power that he had, that would have controlled the sugar situation, when he might have secured the sugar crop last summer. Last December we passed additional legislation, due to the efforts of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], and the President refused to exercise the power conferred upon him by that legislation, and the result is that we have the sugar situation that exists to-day.

Mr. President, it seems impossible to have this administration even attempt to enforce the laws that would stop this profiteering; and perhaps we shall have to wait a few months longer, until a new administration comes into power that will enforce the laws to correct the conditions that now exist.

But, Mr. President, I intended to say a few words upon the pending question, which is the river and harbor bill.

Mr. President, I am in favor of liberal expenditures for the improvement of rivers and harbors; but those who undertake to say that the \$20,000,000 that is provided by the committee in this bill does not take into consideration the needs of the rivers and harbors of this country are mistaken. The fact is that this \$20,000,000, with the amount that is now on hand, will permit for the coming year twice the amount of the average expenditures for the past five years; and remember this river and harbor bill is not a bill running from the 1st of July of one year to the 1st of July of the next year. The money is available under this bill when the bill is enacted, and the next river and harbor bill must be enacted before the 4th of next March. So we are not providing for a full year's expenditure under this bill. We are providing for the expenditure only up to the 1st of next March, and this will permit the expenditure, with the unexpended balances, with the amount now on hand, as stated by the Senator from Washington yesterday, of \$51,000,000 between now and the 1st of next March, while the average expenditure during the last five fiscal years has been only \$26,229,000.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Certainly.

Mr. HARRISON. How does the Senator get the amount he stated—\$51,000,000?

Mr. LENROOT. Thirty-one million dollars, the Senator from Washington stated yesterday, is now on hand in unexpended balances, and this bill carries \$20,000,000.

Mr. HARRISON. But the Senator from Washington stated that on the 1st of July there would probably be about \$12,000,000 on hand. That was as I understood the chairman of the committee.

Mr. LENROOT. No; on these projects, I think.

Mr. HARRISON. He stated that there would be a balance probably of about \$12,000,000 at the end of this fiscal year.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Col. Taylor advised the committee that there was \$36,000,000 on hand the 1st of February for all projects throughout the country. That is at a rate of expenditure of about five millions a month. So if we spend at that rate up until the 1st of July there will then be on hand out of the \$36,000,000 about twelve or thirteen million, and adding twenty million more will make \$32,000,000 or \$33,000,000.

Mr. LENROOT. That will be \$32,000,000 from the 1st of July to the 1st of the following March.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is correct.

Mr. HARRISON. But the chairman of the committee and the Senator from Wisconsin, who is a member of the committee, will agree that the most of that \$12,000,000 is contracted for certain specified projects and is to be used on those particular projects.

Mr. LENROOT. Certainly; but that does not affect the amount of money which is being expended for the purpose of river and harbor improvement this year, which I state will be approximately twice as much as the average for the past five years.

Mr. HARRISON. We have been very niggardly in the past five years.

Mr. LENROOT. That may be; but the fact is, Mr. President, that so far as finding the money is concerned to pay for the expenditures of the Government, there was no year during the past five years when the money was not easier found than it is this year. We have never had a time when we have faced so difficult and so desperate a situation with regard to the Treasury. There is a reason for that, and, to say nothing about the profligate extravagances through the war by the administrative officers of the Government, the reason is that there does not seem to be a single member of the administration in its executive side who seems to know that for all practical purposes the war is over, and they are asking for money in every department of the Government without the slightest regard for the interest of the taxpayer or the slightest regard for economy. They are asking, as is well known, in the various appropriation bills for this year more than a billion dollars in excess of what Congress is going to grant to them.

More than that, as is well known, under authority given for war purposes, which it never was dreamed would be exercised after the 11th day of November, 1918, departments of the Government, using that authority given to them for the purpose of prosecuting the war, and because Congress did not believe there would be any abuse of authority to use the power in time of peace, have obligated the Treasury to the extent of millions of dollars, which we have to find the money now to pay for.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator kindly specify what those obligations are?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes. I do not know what it would aggregate, but following the 11th day of November I say that the War Department had no moral right to go into the purchase of land and to make contracts for which the power was given them for the purpose of prosecuting the war.

Mr. REED. To what extent have they done that?

Mr. LENROOT. They have done it in regard to nearly every piece of real estate which the War Department was using during the war. That is a pretty strong statement, and I will modify it. They have done it in many cases where they made a valid contract, where if Congress had been free—and I happened to be a member of a subcommittee considering it—where if Congress had been free it never would have authorized the incurring of those expenditures. But they made valid contracts and we are compelled to find the money to pay for them.

Mr. REED. I am not asking these questions in a controversial spirit.

Mr. LENROOT. I understand.

Mr. REED. But I am interested, now that the Senator has mentioned the War Department. Does he know of other cases outside of the War Department?

Mr. LENROOT. I think there were, not lately but following the armistice, some contracts made by our Shipping Board and Housing Corporation which, in my judgment, ought not to have been made. I am very glad to say that I believe there has been nothing going on of that character by the Shipping Board for the past year.

But I have no doubt, Mr. President, that we are compelled to pay hundreds of millions of dollars out of the Treasury now for

expenditures incurred by the various departments of the Government, through powers given them for the purpose of prosecuting the war, where Congress would not have approved the expenditures had it been free to act upon them after the armistice of November 11, 1918.

So we have this condition, Mr. President. The Treasury is in a desperate condition. Where are we going to get the money? It does not seem to occur to some Senators that that is a question which Congress has any concern with. A deficit in the Treasury will face us within the next 12 months, and it behooves every Senator to consider that in connection with these appropriation bills.

That being true, with the \$20,000,000 provided by this bill, which will give an expenditure of twice as much as the average expenditure in the past five years, I do not see that those of us who are in favor of liberal appropriations for our rivers and harbors, where they are legitimately required, can have any ground for criticism.

I do not know of any other expenditure in any department of the Government where we are doubling by any appropriation bill the average expenditures during the previous five years. In fact, I think you will find that every other appropriation bill, except this river and harbor bill, has a reduction of expenditures, and this is the only one which provides an increase, when consideration is given to the unexpended balances on hand.

One word more, Mr. President. Much has been said concerning the fact that there are no new projects included in this bill. I agree with what the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] said to-day and the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] said yesterday. I have no doubt whatever that we will spend the money under the \$20,000,000 appropriation upon old projects, where there will be very much less benefit to commerce, where there is less urgency for their expenditure, than many new projects which are pending.

The Senator from New York referred to the project at Jamaica Bay. I have one for my own State—Wisconsin—Green Bay, where there is a very great urgency for immediate improvement, where it has been favorably recommended, where the commerce exceeds over a million dollars, and the city is very rapidly growing. But under the policy of the committee no new projects were included.

The fact is, Mr. President, if we would put this whole matter of river and harbor improvements upon a basis which will command the support of the country we must be more careful in the future concerning the merits of each of the particular projects. If we would have the country support Congress in the making of appropriations for river and harbor improvements, we must see to it that where we do spend money there is a reasonable prospect that, from a business standpoint, commerce will float upon the rivers and harbors to such a degree as to warrant the expenditure.

What has given the stigma to river and harbor bills in the past is the fact, and it is a fact, that we have improved little rivers and creeks in various parts of the country where there has never been and never will be any commerce upon them at all commensurate with the cost to the Government.

So, Mr. President, I hope this amendment to the amendment of the committee will be defeated. If the bill remains at \$20,000,000 it will provide for all the money which can be safely expended this year in view of the present condition of the Treasury.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am quite content with the amount of the total appropriations of the bill as reported from the committee. I would have been more content with the bill as passed by the House. I did not rise, however, to comment upon the measure so much as to submit one or two remarks suggested by the criticism of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] of the administration in the Department of Justice as affecting the very popular subject of profiteering.

The Senator informs the country that abundant legislation upon that subject exists upon the statute books, but because of its nonenforcement, or insufficient enforcement, the unfortunate industrial conditions of the time persist. If that is true, it is a very serious indictment. If it is not true, then it should not be permitted to go unchallenged.

There are a number of statutes enacted by Congress designed to punish profiteering, all of them based upon a generally accepted but totally fallacious theory that profiteering can be controlled by legislation and that the prices of commodities can be reduced by controlling the profiteers. I do not hesitate to say, Mr. President, that no more unfounded theory ever prevailed. It is a natural one. It is one which has been acted upon by generations of the past whenever profiteering existed.

The generations that are to come will, under similar conditions, occupy a similar attitude, all of which means that we are largely incapable of learning from history or by experience.

The profiteer is not the cause of high prices. He is a consequence of high prices, and he is so much an essential consequence that at no time in the past, if my reading of history is correct, has he been absent when the opportunity presented itself for his activity. The profiteer flourishes in Germany, England, France, Italy, Belgium, and even in Turkey, as well as in the United States, and an attempt to legislate him out of existence by the operation of punitive statutes has been as abortive there as it is and will be abortive here.

It is true that you can punish an occasional violator of the law; it is true that you can prosecute all of them, or rather the most conspicuous ones; but the profiteer will persist, and always has persisted nevertheless. The public conception of a profiteer is a large, stolid, well-dressed, diamond-bedizened individual, wearing a plug hat and smoking a cigar at an angle of 45 degrees. It is an ideal picture, in other words, of the plethoric millionaire. The profiteer in practice is about as numerous as the members of the American Legion. They differ in amount and in degree, but not in kind.

The association which strikes for inordinate wages, such, for example, as those engineering the strike at present in the city of Butte, Mont., are profiteers pure and simple. Those who demand an inordinate raise of wages or compensation, who take advantage of existing conditions for the purpose of enforcing demands, are profiteers, although the public does not so regard them. Those in the possession of raw material or of food who hold and wait the rise in the market are profiteers as well as those who corner the market and who by so doing commit a crime against the common law and against the statutes of their country.

It is a sort of infectious disease, and very little political capital can be made out of the proposition that one administration fails to enforce laws which, if enforced, would rid the Nation of the difficulty, as is the promise of their enforcement in the event of a change of administration. Nearly all the big so-called profiteers whom I know personally or know of personally are members of the Republican Party. That is no reflection upon them. In some quarters it may be regarded as an advantage, but I imagine, Mr. President, if the next election results in a change of administration and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] is returned to his seat by his constituency that at the end of that administration the assurance which he a few moments ago gave to the country of what would become of the profiteer in the event that such a happy situation, from his standpoint, will prove as miserable a failure as are the attempts, in the estimation of the Senator, of the present administration in that direction.

I do not believe in profiteering. I want to see the Government punish every man who makes inordinate profit at this time. He ought to be punished, and I care not in what station in life he may be found; I care not what the extent of his profiteering may be, whether it is \$10 or \$10,000,000; I would like to see it stopped, but surely we ought to reflect—we must ultimately perceive, if we do not reflect at this time—that we are fighting conditions instead of causes and acting very largely like a child who stumbles over a chair and turns around and kicks the chair in his impotent rage as the proximate cause of his injury.

In France during and after the revolution, in England during and after the end of the Napoleonic wars, in France and Germany at the end of the Franco-Prussian War, in America upon the close of the Civil War, these conditions existed. Attempts were made to regulate them in precisely the same way. They failed as these will fail, and we may for political or other reasons on both sides of the Chamber rage against these conditions, indulge in crimination and recrimination, but they will go on. There is but one way and only one way, a hard and rugged one, in which normal conditions will return to this country. It is everybody's business to see that they do return; and if all of the men and women of the country will begin to increase the productivity of the Nation, will by their labors and their exertions contribute to the sum of the results of plentifulness in all the necessities of life on the one hand, and will live as closely as possible to the line of economy upon the other, automatically the so-called good times will return, and they never will return until we do it, legislation or no legislation, recrimination or no recrimination.

It is a plain, sensible proposition, one which nations in previous times have, sometimes consciously but nearly always unconsciously, recognized in their operations. The present overalls brigade is a beginning. It has some fantastic features, but it is a beginning. If it can only be continued in other lines of

necessity, and if in our diet we will assume the same situation, then there will be a change of conditions.

The Senator from Wisconsin talks about the scarcity of sugar. That is deplorable, but the way to have an abundance of sugar is to eat less sugar during these times. Unfortunately the Government itself is and has been setting an example of extravagance that is not at all commendable. I do not agree with the Senator in his criticisms of the departments, who, he says, have been indulging in reckless expenditures since the armistice; that is to say, I do not accept all of his assertions.

The War Department has been compelled to carry out contracts made during the war for lands and for articles supposed to be necessary and which were necessary for war purposes and which contracts they have been unable to cancel upon rational and equitable terms since. They should not be blamed for that. In some instances the War Department has concluded to carry out enterprises which do not address themselves to my notions of expediency, and the same is true of the Navy.

But here again we are against a fact, a stubborn fact, that can not be overlooked. It is that the expenditures consequent upon war always continue in rising proportions for a long period after the war is ended. The Senator from Wisconsin can not name a great struggle in history in which that has not been true. I do not think we have yet reached that necessary peak of expenditures; I hope we have. That we must take into consideration.

But, Mr. President, we have not set the departments a very good example here. The Senator says we are face to face with a great deficiency, and that is true. There is nothing new about it. We knew it a year ago. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] made the statement more than a year ago that July 1, 1920, would find us face to face with a deficiency of over \$3,000,000,000, because he knew what our expenditures would be, and what the estimates of the receipts of the Government probably would be. That is true. It must be paid ultimately by taxation.

But in the face of those conditions we have been making unnecessary appropriations, and will continue to do so. Yesterday we passed a bill increasing pensions by \$65,000,000, and it created so little interest that there were hardly as many Senators here during the discussion and when it passed as there are in the Chamber at the present time. Congress proposes to listen to the demands of the American Legion and to vote bonuses amounting in all probability to more than \$2,000,000,000. Yet in the face of what we have done and what we propose to do, some of us inconsistently rail at the extravagance of other departments of the Government. I think it would be a most wholesome example which Congress ought to set if, recognizing these conditions, we would begin a little economy on our own account.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. HARRISON. The pending amendment is the Reed amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. HARRISON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Reading Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Harrison	McNary	Smith, Ariz.
Borah	Hitchcock	Moses	Smith, Md.
Brandeggee	Jones, N. Mex.	Nelson	Spencer
Capper	Jones, Wash.	New	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Kellogg	Nugent	Thomas
Curtis	Kendrick	Overman	Trammell
Fernald	Knox	Ransdell	Underwood
Gerry	Lenroot	Reed	Warren
Glass	McCumber	Sheppard	Watson
Harris	McKellar	Stimmons	

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY], the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], and the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-nine Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of the absent Senators.

The names of the absent Senators were called, and Mr. PAGE and Mr. STERLING answered to their names when called.

Mr. KEYES and Mr. ASHURST entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-three Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will carry out the order of the Senate.

Mr. DIAL, Mr. WADSWORTH, Mr. FRANCE, Mr. DILLINGHAM, Mr. COMER, Mr. MCCORMICK, and Mr. HENDERSON entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED].

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] for a moment. In section 10 of the river and harbor act of March 2, 1919, the Secretary of War was empowered to ascertain whether any contracts for river and harbor improvements have become inequitable and unjust on account of increased cost of materials, labor, and other unforeseen conditions arising out of the war with Germany, and to ascertain and report to Congress for consideration what amounts, if any, in addition to those fixed by the terms of such contracts should in justice and equity be paid to such contractors.

Acting under that provision of the river and harbor act, the various Army engineers throughout the country were called upon by the Secretary of War to give the contracts that were made prior to our entry into the war, the name of the contractor, the subject matter of the contract, the quantities and money valuation at contract prices of the work remaining to be performed after April 6, 1917, a statement of the date of the completion of the work, if completed, and if completed after July 18, 1918, or if not yet completed, whether the contractor has presented any claim under section 8 of the river and harbor act of that date, giving the date of the claim, and, if known, the file number.

Reports covering those details have been made by the Government engineers to the Chief of Engineers and by him transmitted to the Secretary of War. There were quite a number of contracts which were reported as inequitable and unjust because of the increased cost of material and labor after we had entered into the war.

The claims so reported amount in all to \$219,916.02. The payment of this amount has been recommended by the Secretary of War or possibly the matter has been submitted to Congress for its consideration.

Amongst other claimants whose contracts were deemed to be inequitable and unjust was Robert Wakefield, of my State, a reputable and honorable citizen, who has done a great deal of Government work. It is recommended that he be paid \$11,322.07. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee if the committee has considered this question at all and whether, in his opinion, it ought to be included in the rivers and harbors bill?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I think that if the claims are ready for settlement and payment they should be referred to the regular Appropriations Committee of the Senate. Congress has passed legislation providing for their adjustment, and on a recommendation as to the amount to be paid being submitted to Congress, I think the proper committee for the matter to go to is the Appropriations Committee. That has been the general rule, I know, with reference to claims that may be considered as audited. I do not think that it would be proper to attach such claims on this bill, but, if they are in the shape indicated, they would be very proper items either upon the general deficiency bill or upon the sundry civil bill.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The matter was considered to some extent, I think, by the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House, but no action was taken.

These claims ought to be paid. They are large enough in some instances to impair the credit and probably to make bankrupt some of these people; and I want to say to the Senator now that while I do not want to encumber this bill with any suggested amendment which will retard its passage, I shall undertake to have an amendment put on the next rivers and harbors bill if we can not get action taken by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, there is not any question in my mind but that the Appropriations Committee will give these matters its careful consideration when the appropriation bills come up; but if the claims are sent down in the proper way, I know of no reason why they should not be placed upon appropriation bills if they are found to be correct.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Just a moment. These estimates were sent down by the Secretary of War on the 29th of March, 1920, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, itemized, and giving in detail just what the items were for, and I think

the Speaker referred them to the Rivers and Harbors Committee on the other side of the Capitol.

I now yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me for a moment, I merely wish to say that there are at least two concerns in my State that are interested in claims coming exactly within the category described by the Senator from Oregon. They are firms with which I am well acquainted. They are reputable and competent. The conditions were changed for them by the acts of the Government after the time they made their contracts—conditions that were entirely beyond their control, for which they had no responsibility whatever. There is no question in my mind but that they have a just claim against the Government. It is a question, I suppose, of where and how that claim should be presented.

As I understand, the Senator from Washington does not contest the validity of the claims at all. As the Senator from Oregon has stated, they have gone to the Secretary of War after having passed the inspection of the Engineer Department and received their approval. The Secretary of War has approved them, and has given that approval in a formal way in a letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Possibly a mistake has been made at some point along the line in presenting the claims in this bill; but, whether in this or some other bill, the claims ought to be adjudicated. I think they should be allowed; and if the Senator from Oregon has an amendment to propose, and will include in that amendment the companies of which I speak, and whose cases come exactly within the description he has given, I shall be very glad to support it, unless there can be some sort of understanding that they will have the consideration to which they are certainly entitled on some other bill.

I think myself it is possible that the proper place for them is on the general deficiency bill. I am not disposed to in any way interfere with the passage of this bill if this is not the proper place for these claims, but it is certainly true that they are entitled to consideration.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, several Senators have spoken to me about claims of this character, and I suppose they are probably covered in the letter that the Senator from Oregon has—the Senator from Minnesota, the Senator from Michigan, Mr. TOWNSEND, I think the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. MCKELLAR, and probably other Senators. I have told them that in my judgment these claims should go to the Appropriations Committee to have their amount carried in an appropriation bill.

I will say to the Senator from Indiana and to the Senator from Oregon that if it is found that these claims are not in a position to be taken care of in an appropriation bill, if further legislation is necessary in order that they may be presented to Congress in the proper form, I shall be glad for the River and Harbor Committee—if that is the proper committee, and I think it would be—to look into the matter and to do it in the next bill; but I am very strongly of the opinion that if these estimates have come down in the proper form, in compliance with the law that we passed, under which, as I understand, these claims were to be audited and the amount due to be fixed, they can be properly taken care of in an appropriation bill.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator is entirely correct, except in one particular—that it is not a finding of liability by the department. They recommend to Congress what in their judgment should be the amount to be paid.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That may be true. Then it would be for the Appropriations Committee, I take it, to pass upon that.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I do not know the exact language of these claims; but the place for them, if they have reached the proper point, is on a deficiency bill, of course. I am very careful about promising beforehand what can go on a bill, because we sometimes have to meet very urgent opposition on the other side; but I do say that it is my desire always, as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, to take care in the deficiency bill of everything that has arrived at the proper stage and is in proper shape to go on that bill. I believe in sweeping up clean every time.

We have pending a deficiency bill which is right here on my desk, but that is of a special nature. It is only a matter of a very few items; but before the end of this session there will follow a general deficiency bill. Whether or not these matters offered by the Senator from Oregon are in shape to be submitted as audited claims I am unable to say; but I can give the assurance that it is my intention, as chairman of the Appro-

priations Committee, to clean up everything that confronts that committee to the day we report that is proper to be contained in a deficiency bill. These items seem to be in the nature of a deficiency, if they have passed the proper examination, and, of course, we will then have behind them, or should have, the further proof, if any is necessary.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, these claims always have my sympathy, because a man may have a claim of a few hundred dollars against the Government of the United States, and it may be accepted by the proper tribunals, but they play battledore and shuttlecock with it when it gets here, and it is sometimes a physical impossibility ever to get it through.

Take these claims. They all grow out of river and harbor construction. There is not any question about their validity or their justice. The distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, as he intimated a while ago, has always been fair in the consideration of these matters, but I greatly fear that when this one comes up to the committee he will find quite a number of Senators on the committee who will say, "Oh, that ought to go in a claims bill," and the Claims Committee may not think it ought to consider it, with the result that, unless some committee will take it and fairly consider it as it deserves to be considered these claims will be hanging for a long while.

I have not undertaken to impede the progress of this river and harbor bill; in fact, I want it to go through; but I do express the hope as to all of these people, although each individual claim is small, that the Committee on Appropriations will take up the matter, because it has been reported in all respects as the act of 1919 provides.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield.

• Mr. LENROOT. I merely want to say that I do not believe in any event there would be any possible warrant for saying that any of these matters should go to the Claims Committee. They are only claims against the Government by virtue of legislation we passed in the last river and harbor bill, and every one of them is audited and the amount fixed in the report made to Congress, so there can be nothing for the Committee on Claims to find.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I hope the Senator is right, and I do not think myself that it ought to go there. I think the Committee on Appropriations can dispose of it finally.

Mr. LENROOT. I think so.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] a few questions about the pending amendment.

As I understand, the bill reported from the committee carries an appropriation of \$20,000,000. The amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri increases that amount to \$27,000,000. I am especially interested, not only as a citizen of Virginia but also as a great friend of the Navy, in the improvements at Norfolk Harbor.

Norfolk Harbor, with Hampton Roads, is becoming one of the industrial and commercial centers of this country. In recent years, next to New York, it is getting to be the greatest import and export port of the entire country.

The railroads that center there, I believe, will ultimately make Chesapeake Bay the industrial, commercial, and manufacturing center of this country. Baltimore is interested in it, and thousands and thousands of industries on Chesapeake Bay. The roads that center at Norfolk extend from the far West, Kansas City, St. Louis, and the Great Lakes. In addition to that, we have built at Norfolk, impelled by the necessities of the occasion, the greatest naval base and shipyard anywhere, in which we are now constructing the very largest ships. It requires a depth of 40 feet for ships to go to the dry docks, on which the Government has spent a great deal of money, and this 40-foot depth must have a certain breadth to enable these ships to come in.

I understand that the original recommendation was for the appropriation of \$750,000 to complete that work satisfactorily, not only for the commerce of that port but also to enable the dry docks and battleships being constructed there to be properly utilized. I understand that that was reduced to \$400,000, which is all that will be obtained unless this amendment prevails; and I understand that if this amendment prevails there will be money available to complete that great work at Norfolk. With an appropriation of \$27,000,000, would there be available the \$750,000 which they have been insisting is absolutely necessary for Norfolk Harbor?

Mr. JONES of Washington. They do not insist that \$750,000 is absolutely necessary. The revised estimate of the engineers places the amount at \$400,000. They have on hand for Norfolk Harbor \$813,766. With the \$400,000 they would have over a

million two hundred thousand dollars, and the engineer placed in his revised estimate \$400,000 for Norfolk Harbor.

Mr. SWANSON. I understand that.

Mr. JONES of Washington. He says in his letter, in answer to my letter, that they should have \$400,000. That would be taken care of in the \$20,000,000. Of course, if we appropriate \$27,000,000, they could expend more there; or they might take that money and put it into other projects. They are not required to put it in any particular place.

Mr. SWANSON. I understood the estimate originally was for \$750,000, and the Senator wrote a letter asking them if they could not reduce it to something less. As I understand, the money on hand now was for something that has already been appropriated for, and it will complete that work; but the channel must be made broader in order that ships, especially battleships, may come in and out, so they can be dry-docked.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is what the engineers say in their letter in answer to my letter.

Mr. SWANSON. That the \$400,000 might enable them to continue the work for a reasonable time, but that they certainly could not do that work for less than \$750,000. That is based possibly on an idea that there might be a deficiency appropriation bill after the elections are over.

Mr. JONES of Washington. No, Mr. President. I regret such suggestions with reference to political expediency, and so forth. I know that has had nothing to do with the consideration of this bill in the Commerce Committee of the Senate, and I have not considered it for one moment. This is the idea, that we will have another river and harbor bill by the 4th of next March.

Mr. SWANSON. It will not be operative, though, until the 30th of June.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; the appropriations in river and harbor bills are always immediately available. That is largely the basis upon which Col. Taylor acted in reducing a great many of these amounts. He expressly states in his testimony that we will have a river and harbor bill by the 4th of next March, because that is the time the present Congress ends. He says \$400,000, with the \$830,000 on hand, will take care of Norfolk Harbor.

Mr. SWANSON. Up until the 4th of March?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes.

Mr. SWANSON. But he admits that he could not do this work so that the battleships could go in the dry docks and be launched, after completion, unless he gets \$750,000, does he not?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; he does not say that.

Mr. SWANSON. That is the substance of what he has written, as I have gathered it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; he says in his letter to me—

Mr. SWANSON. That is, when you wrote asking him to reduce the amount from \$750,000 to \$400,000?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; when I wrote him asking whether Norfolk Harbor could be omitted entirely. The appropriation recommended by Col. Taylor's memorandum is \$750,000. The original estimates give it as a million dollars, but possibly that was wrong. He says:

The entire omission of this item is suggested in your letter. The project for the improvement of this harbor provides in its main feature for a channel 40 feet in depth to the navy yard. The Navy Department has recently completed, it is understood, a dry dock at the head of this channel capable of receiving the largest ships, and the entire capacity of the project channel is necessary for the proper utilization of this dry dock. With the available funds and under existing contracts, it is expected to secure a channel 40 feet in depth, but the width of this channel is insufficient for its proper utilization. The vigorous prosecution of the work of enlarging the channel is considered highly essential. The funds on hand are insufficient to undertake this enlargement, and the omission of the item presented would be highly inadvisable.

The revised estimate, as I said, was placed at \$400,000. Col. Taylor, according to my recollection, in his testimony before the House committee, just as he did with reference to several reductions which he had made, based it upon the idea that we would have another bill by the 1st of March; in other words, that the appropriation is not for a whole year, but for three-quarters of a year, and he expects the additional amount to be available, and with this \$1,200,000 he can carry on the work. Of course, if the amount carried by the bill should be increased to \$27,000,000, and that should become a law, then there would be more money available for Norfolk Harbor and more money available for other various harbors in the country. Of course, that is true. If we should raise it to \$40,000,000 there would be more money for not only Norfolk Harbor but for many other harbors and rivers throughout the country. The same argu-

ment that has been used against the twenty million in this bill can be used also against the twenty-seven million; in other words, the amendment providing for \$27,000,000, I take it, is proposed instead of one for forty or fifty million because it was thought that that was about the best that could be gotten. The \$20,000,000 recommended by the Commerce Committee is not all that several of the members of the committee would like to have. It is more than some think we are really justified in appropriating for at this time, but it is the amount which the majority of the committee felt we really ought to have in order to meet imperative needs. I believe that that amount will pretty well take care of the situation.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, the appropriation of \$20,000,000 is conditioned on the idea that Congress must certainly pass a river and harbor bill before the 4th of March. Experience has taught me that at the short sessions very rarely do we get a river and harbor bill through, unless we make tremendous concessions. Senators can, if they wish, filibuster up to the 4th of March.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. SWANSON. Certainly.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator will remember that some seven or eight years or more ago the policy was adopted of having a river and harbor bill at every regular session, and my recollection is that since that policy was adopted we have not failed to have a river and harbor bill at each session.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, that is true; but on account of the shortness of the session, and owing to the fact that half a dozen or a dozen Senators can filibuster and prevent the passage of any bill unless we surrender everything to suit their demands, it is nearly impossible to get through a good, satisfactory bill suitable to the commerce of the country at a short session. If we were satisfied that we could get through a river and harbor bill at the short session of Congress to take care of this enterprise, which is absolutely necessary, not only for the country but acknowledged by the Army Engineers to be indispensable for the Navy to provide for the great battleships which are being constructed there, and for the docking of these immense ships, it would be well to let it go over, but I am satisfied that when we come here at the short session, if we get a bill through it will mean a surrender on all these appropriations, and it will be nearly impossible to take care of these enterprises. Having had experience in the House and the Senate, I am satisfied that when the chairman of the committee is here at the next session, about the 2d of March, when the appropriation bill comes up, and it is known that there will be a filibuster for two or three days, you will get nothing except something that five or six Senators who, very illiberal and ungenerous in promoting the commerce of this country, agree to; and we shall have to make concessions and surrender to them. In view of that condition I think it is wise at this time to increase the appropriation to \$27,000,000.

There is not a man who will claim that it would be a waste. The very men who advocate \$20,000,000 will admit that you can not do this work for 12 months unless you get a bill through before the 4th of March to carry on the work from the 4th of March to the 30th of June. I am not familiar with any of these projects except that in connection with Norfolk Harbor. I do know about that. I know it is a great port. I know it is the second port in the United States. I know its commerce is growing by leaps and bounds. I know it is crowded. I know it is the greatest naval base in the world. I know they have prepared it as a place for docking the great ships. The Army and Navy insisted upon it, and it seems to me it is wise at this time to make this appropriation of \$27,000,000. I shall vote for the amendment to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I wish to suggest that if we are not going to have a river and harbor bill at the next session, I doubt very much if Norfolk will get anything of the additional sum. There will be so many other projects throughout the country which will want it divided up that there will be nothing left for that harbor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STERLING in the chair). The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] to the amendment.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Reading Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENDRICK (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], and vote "yea."

Mr. MOSES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY]. I

transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] and vote "nay."

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote "yea."

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. KIRBY. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], who is absent on account of illness. I transfer that pair to the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and vote "yea."

Mr. GLASS (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN], which I transfer to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] and permit my vote to stand.

Mr. BALL. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] and vote "nay."

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] and vote "nay."

Mr. STERLING (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (after having voted in the negative). May I inquire if the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That Senator has not voted.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I transfer my general pair with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. I transfer the pair to the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] and vote "yea."

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish to announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is unavoidably absent from the Senate. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE];

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH];

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS];

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON];

The Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON];

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS]; and

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON].

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 24, nays 20, as follows:

YEAS—24.

Ashurst	Kendrick	Overman	Spencer
Chamberlain	Kirby	Ransdell	Sterling
Dial	Knox	Reed	Swanson
Glass	McKellar	Sheppard	Thomas
Harris	McNary	Simmons	Trammell
Harrison	Nugent	Smith, Ariz.	Underwood

NAYS—20.

Ball	France	Keyes	New
Brandegee	Gerry	Lenroot	Page
Capper	Jones, Wash.	McCumber	Sutherland
Curtis	Kellogg	Moses	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Kenyon	Nelson	Warren

NOT VOTING—52.

Beckham	Gay	McCormick	Sherman
Borah	Gore	McLean	Shields
Calder	Gronna	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Colt	Hale	Newberry	Smith, Md.
Comer	Harding	Norris	Smith, S. C.
Culberson	Henderson	Owen	Smoot
Cummins	Hitchcock	Penrose	Stanley
Edge	Johnson, Calif.	Pheasant	Townsend
Elkins	Johnson, S. Dak.	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Fall	Jones, N. Mex.	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Fernald	King	Polindexter	Watson
Fletcher	La Follette	Pomerene	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Robinson	Wolcott

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] to the amendment of the committee, the yeas are 24 and the nays are 20. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] is present and not voting. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Reading Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Glass	McNary	Spencer
Ball	Harrison	Moses	Sterling
Brandeggee	Jones, Wash.	Nelson	Sutherland
Capper	Kellogg	New	Swanson
Chamberlain	Kendrick	Nugent	Thomas
Comer	Kenyon	Overman	Trammell
Curtis	Keyes	Ransdell	Underwood
Dial	Kirby	Reed	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Lenroot	Sheppard	Warren
France	McKellar	Simmons	Watson
Gerry	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The names of the absent Senators were called and Mr. KNOX answered to his name when called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators. The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will carry out the instructions of the Senate.

Mr. GRONNA, Mr. PAGE, and Mr. HARRIS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. OVERMAN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

On a division, the Senate refused to adjourn.

Mr. BORAH and Mr. SMITH of Maryland entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum is present. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Reading Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as to my pair and its transfer as on the last roll call, I vote "yea."

Mr. KENDRICK (when his name was called). I make the same announcement as to the transfer of my pair as on the last vote and vote "yea."

Mr. KIRBY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], which I transfer to the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], and vote "yea."

Mr. MOSES (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement of my pair and its transfer as on the previous vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when his name was called). I make the same announcement that I made a few moments ago with reference to the transfer of my pair and vote "yea."

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). Announcing my pair as on the last vote, I withhold my vote. The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BALL (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. STERLING. Making the same transfer of my pair as on the previous vote, I vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS. I inquire if the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed he has not voted.

Mr. THOMAS. I withhold my vote, as I have a pair with that Senator. I desire, however, to be counted to make a quorum.

Mr. TRAMMELL (after having voted in the affirmative). I desire to announce the same transfer of my pair as on the last vote and will allow my vote to stand.

The yeas and nays resulted as follows:

YEAS—25.

Ashurst	Kendrick	Ransdell	Sterling
Chamberlain	Kirby	Reed	Swanson
Comer	Knox	Sheppard	Trammell
Dial	McKellar	Simmons	Underwood
Glass	McNary	Smith, Ariz.	
Harris	Nugent	Smith, Md.	
Harrison	Overman	Spencer	

NAYS—21.

Ball	France	Keyes	Sutherland
Borah	Gerry	Lenroot	Wadsworth
Brandeggee	Gronna	Moses	Warren
Capper	Jones, Wash.	Nelson	
Curtis	Kellogg	New	
Dillingham	Kenyon	Page	

NOT VOTING—50.

Beckham	Hale	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Calder	Harding	Newberry	Smith, S. C.
Colt	Henderson	Norris	Smoot
Culberson	Hitchcock	Owen	Stanley
Cummins	Johnson, Calif.	Penrose	Thomas
Edge	Johnson, S. Dak.	Phelan	Townsend
Elkins	Jones, N. Mex.	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Fall	King	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Fernald	La Follette	Polindexter	Watson
Fletcher	Lodge	Pomerene	Williams
Frelinghuysen	McCormick	Robinson	Wolcott
Gay	McCumber	Sherman	
Gore	McLean	Shields	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the amendment of the Senator from Missouri the yeas are 25, the nays are 21. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] are present, but have not voted. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harrison	Nugent	Sterling
Ball	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Sutherland
Brandeggee	Kellogg	Page	Swanson
Capper	Kendrick	Ransdell	Thomas
Comer	Keyes	Reed	Trammell
Curtis	Knox	Sheppard	Underwood
Dial	Lenroot	Simmons	Wadsworth
Dillingham	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.	Warren
Glass	McNary	Smith, Md.	Watson
Gronna	New	Spencer	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Thirty-seven Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Reading Clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. BORAH, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. KENYON, Mr. MOSES, and Mr. NELSON answered to their names when called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, it seems to be impossible to get a quorum this afternoon. I therefore move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, April 26, 1920, at 12 o'clock meridian.

SENATE.

MONDAY, April 26, 1920.

Rev. John Paul Tyler, of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray. Almighty God, father of life and of mercies, giver of every good and perfect gift, command upon us, we beseech Thee, Thy blessing as we enter upon the activities of another day and another week. Bless us in all that we shall do or say. Enlighten our minds with Thy wisdom, that with unselfish devotion to Thy righteousness in the earth through our lives and labors Thy kingdom may come. Forgive us our blindness and our selfishness. Help us to see and to do Thy will.

Let Thy blessing rest upon our native land, we pray, upon the President of our United States, upon all the Members of this Congress, upon the loved ones in homes, wherever they are. Keep them, protect, shield, and direct them. Guide us by Thy counsel, and afterwards receive us into glory. For we ask it in the name of our Lord and Savior, who taught us when we pray to say:

Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread, and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us. Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil, for Thine is the kingdom, the power, and the glory forever. Amen.

The Reading Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Friday, April 23, 1920, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.